

GLENCOE PARK DISTRICT

Committee of the Whole Meeting Tuesday, October 6, 2020 - 7:00pm Zoom Video/Audio Conference or In-Person

Consistent with the requirements of the Illinois Compiled Statutes 5 ILCS 120/1 through 120/6 (Open Meetings Act), notices of this meeting were posted. Location of the meeting is **Zoom -or-** Takiff Center, 999 Green Bay Rd, Glencoe, IL 60022

The Board of Park Commissioner's President determined that an in-person meeting is not practical or prudent due to the issuance by the Governor of a disaster declaration related to public health concerns in all or a part of the jurisdiction of the District, and the President stated that physical presence at the meeting location was determined by the District to be unfeasible due to the disaster. If you prefer to attend in-person, please enter Takiff Center around the back at the main entrance. Please note that Commissioners will be attending via Zoom, and Executive Director Lisa Sheppard will be attending in-person.

<u>AGENDA</u>

- I. Call to Order
- II. Roll Call
- III. Matters from the Public
- IV. Discussion on 2021/2022 Levy Amount (pgs. 2-12)
- V. Discussion on Recommendation for Health Insurance Renewal (pgs. 13-17)
- VI. Discussion on Watts Ice Rink Operations amidst COVID-19 (pgs. 18-27)
- VII. Discussion on Youth Basketball Operations amidst COVID-19 (pgs. 28-35)
- VIII. Discussion on Kalk Park Project Phase 2 (pgs. 36-49)
- IX. Other Business
- X. Adjourn

The Glencoe Park District is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the meeting or facilities, are asked to contact the Park District at 847-835-3030. Executive Director E-mail address: Isheppard@glencoeparkdistrict.com

Three Ways to Join this Meeting on Zoom: Meeting ID: 892 2490 3338 | Password: 999

Via Phone Dial In

312-626-6799

Via Computer

Go to Zoom.us, Click 'Join a Meeting', Enter the Meeting

ID and Password above

Via SmartPhone

If you don't already have the app, go to your smartphone's app store and load 'Zoom

Cloud Meeting' (free)

The Board of Park Commissioners welcomes public comments during all meetings.

Option 1: Via Zoom Video - Attend the Zoom meeting via video and utilize the "raise hand" feature to indicate a desire to speak during Matters from the Public.

Option 2: Via Zoom Dial In - Attend the Zoom meeting via Dial In (audio only) and vocalize your desire to speak once prompted that it is Matters from the Public.

Option 3: Via Email in Advance of the Meeting - Submit a public comment via email to Isheppard@glencoeparkdistrict.com up until 15 minutes prior to the scheduled meeting. The email must include the speaker's name (address is optional). Public comments will be read aloud by a member of the Park Board or the Executive Director during the scheduled meeting.

Key rules governing participation:

- -Each person is limited to one (1) email submission for public comment not exceeding 250 words.
- -All comments will be limited to three (3) minutes per person and no longer than 30 minutes for all comments.
- -All comments must be civil in nature. Comments will be rejected if the content is slanderous or threatening.



IV. Discussion on 2021/2022 Levy Amount

TO: Board of Park Commissioners
 CC: Lisa Sheppard, Executive Director
 FROM: Carol Mensinger, Director of Finance/HR
 SUBJECT: 2020 Tax Levy Process and Overview

DATE: October 2, 2020

It is that time of year again when we begin the legal cycle for our **next** fiscal year, FY2021/22. The first step in that cycle is to determine the District's levy amount and to approve the 2020 Tax Levy Ordinance which is filed with the Cook County Clerk's Office.

Last year, the District approved an operating levy increase of 4.93%, which allowed for the 1.9% CPI plus estimated new growth of 3.03%. Per the **final** extension for 2019 that was received this past June, the actual new growth increased only 0.63% - this means we actually met our full potential to collect all "new growth" dollars.

The law requires all taxing bodies in Cook County to hold a public hearing on the proposed levy if the proposed aggregate levy exceeds the amount extended for the previous year by 105%. Even if the proposed aggregate levy does not exceed the amount extended by 105%, a public hearing can still be held.

To better understand this levy process, staff offers the following information each year on this process. Obviously, the COVID-19 pandemic impacted the *budget* this year and will next year, but the *levy process/philosophy* remains relatively consistent.

Tax Levy Process – A General Explanation

While the levy process can be confusing, simply stated, it is the legal pre-requisite to a governmental entity receiving money from taxation. It is **not** an appropriation, which is the authorization for the **expenditure** of monies from taxes and other revenue sources. Rather, it is the **authority to collect** tax revenue to finance the District's expenses. Historically, the District's revenue sources consist of approximately 50% tax revenues and 50% program and user fees. In this COVID year, however, these percentages will not be the case.

Each year, the District is required to estimate the amount of money to be raised by taxation for use in the following fiscal year. For example, the tax year 2020 levy relates to tax revenues to be collected in FY2021/22 (March 1, 2021 through February 28, 2022). This estimated amount is called the "aggregate levy amount" and must be stated in a formal resolution passed by the Board. This is typically done at the October or November board meeting. The District is required to publish a notice and hold a public hearing on the proposed property tax levy if the aggregate operating levy increase is greater than 105% of last year's extension. The hearing typically takes place at the regular board meeting in November or December.

The total aggregate levy is made up of both the **operational levy** and the **debt service levy**. The operational portion is determined by the amount of the District's levy request **and**



numerous unknown variables (Equalized Assessed Valuation (EAV), CPI, new development). The debt service portion is determined by the County Clerk and is based solely on the amount of principal and interest due for all outstanding bond ordinances on file with the County. In addition, the County automatically adds a 3% "loss in collection" factor to all operating fund levies and a 5% "loss factor" to the debt service levy. The Property Tax Limitation Act of 1994 (referred to as "the tax cap") drastically changed the levy process. The tax cap limits tax growth on the existing EAV base, often referred to as "old growth", to an increase of 5% or the CPI, whichever is lower. For the 2020 levy, this cap will be **2.3%** - meaning all old growth will be capped at this level. In the past three years, the CPI has been 1.9% (2019), 2.1% (2018), and 2.1% (2017). (Unfortunately, operating expenditures such as health insurance, utilities, gasoline, etc., usually increase above and beyond the CPI.)

The tax cap does **not** limit the collection of property taxes on **new development**, often referred to as "new growth", within the District boundaries as long as the maximum legal tax rates have not been achieved. This would include for example, new subdivisions, new homes, new commercial industry, or newly annexed property. The reason that new growth is not capped is due to a philosophy of equity. Because new homeowners and businesses will be benefiting from parks and facilities already paid for by current District residences and business owners, it is felt that they too should pay their fair share. In the second and subsequent years, this new growth then becomes part of the EAV base, or old growth, and is thus capped at the lower of 5% or the CPI.

Under the tax cap, however, taxing bodies must levy for all potential new growth to actually receive it. If it is not levied for, you will not receive the full potential of all tax monies entitled to the District in the initial year, but it also has a compounding effect because the following year's tax extension is based on the prior year's tax extension, and so on. Therefore, it becomes especially important to make sure the levy amount includes estimation for all new growth anticipated within the District. As mentioned earlier, due to the actual increase in new growth last year, the District did recognize all new growth potential. This is important to remember for each levy.

While it can be difficult to estimate new growth each year within the District, one can look to prior year history to calculate a historical average, and then build in any anticipated new growth, which may be added to the tax rolls in the coming year. This would also include teardowns. Again, levy amounts are estimates. Determination of actual tax amounts that are extended and collected on behalf of the District are not known until all key factors in the calculation are known, usually in June/July. Key factors include the aggregate levy request, total EAV, assessed value of new development, re-assessment of current (or existing) base EAV, statutory limits on tax rates, CPI, and total debt outstanding.

After the tax levy amount is determined and public hearing held, the Tax Levy Ordinance must be approved and filed with the County. This ordinance is an official legal document which outlines by fund, the total amount of taxes to be assessed and levied for and against all property within the District. While the ordinance is typically approved in November or December, it is for tax revenues that will be actually received in the **following** fiscal year.



Although the District's budget process began for staff in September 2020, the budget is discussed by the Board in February/March 2021, and the Budget and Appropriations Ordinance is officially approved in April/May 2021. The final tax information (i.e. tax revenues, tax rate) will not be known until June/July 2021, or even later. Due to the timing of the levy process and the impact of the tax cap, staff is in effect using its "best guess" when it comes to determining the tax levy amount. (Please remember, the Board can also utilize its authority to abate taxes once all the unknowns are known.)

Ultimately, the tax cap limits the amount of tax dollars received on old growth to the lower of the CPI or 5%, no matter what the levy increase is. And the amount of tax dollars received on new growth depends on if you have actually levied enough to receive it.

2020 Tax Levy Amount-Glencoe Park District

Given the information above, staff feels that the District should continue to proceed with a proactive approach by levying an amount which would ensure we are capturing all new growth tax dollars. In addition to the philosophy of equity, capturing all new growth tax dollars becomes especially important when considering the following:

- 1. Unlike the Village, the Park District does not have other revenue sources (ex: sales tax, gasoline tax, etc.) to rely on to operate. The Park District relies primarily on property taxes (50%) and user/program fees/other sources (50%). And in this COVID year, the user fee % will be greatly reduced.
- 2. Operating expenses have increased over and above the CPI increase in recent years. Examples include utilities, insurance premiums, contractual services, wages, gasoline, and pension contributions to IMRF.
- 3. Per the District's Fund Balance Policy, the Board has directed staff to keep minimum fund balance requirements (50% in Corporate and Recreation, and 25% in all other funds) as is advised by the Government Finance Officers Association. This is especially important when faced with large, unexpected repairs, or delays in receiving the second installment of tax revenues.
- 4. Specific funding for the District's Master Plan Projects (Fund 69) has been historically dependent on the surpluses in the Corporate and Recreation Funds. This year, however, the new 2020 bond issue will allow the District to proceed with projects identified in the 3-Year Master Plan without reliance on the excess fund balance reserves. This is especially important as excess fund balance reserves are projected to be minimal until the pandemic is over. Each year, a minimum of approximately \$500,000 is also earmarked for annual capital improvements in the Capital Projects (Fund 65).

Breakdown of Levy Amount by Fund

See attached for additional information on the breakdown of the proposed aggregate levy amount by fund.



Staff Recommendation-2020 Tax Levy Amount

Per the County Clerk's Office, the old growth (or existing EAV base) will be capped at 2.3% CPI. Historically, it was Board philosophy that new homeowners and business owners should pay their fair share for parks and facilities already existing within the District. Thus, it is important to levy an amount to capture all new growth potential. Based on these considerations, staff recommends an **operating** levy amount of \$4,843,000, which is 4.40% greater than last year's final tax extension of \$4,639,076. Realizing that old growth will be capped at 2.3% (CPI) this year no matter what the levy amount is, it is the District's intent in levying 4.40% is only to **ensure** new growth tax dollars (up to 2.10%) are received. Please note, new growth has been under 1.5% in the past ten years, however with the sale and subdivision of the Hoover property, there *potentially* could be some additional "new growth" added this levy year. Likely, this will not impact the District until the 2021 levy.

The District's **debt service** levy amount has remained at an increased level since the successful referendum bond issue in 2006. The total debt service levy amount of **\$1,311,515** includes principal and interest for the 2015 Refunding Bonds (\$1,034,450), and the new 2020 Bonds (\$277,065) which as you are aware, will result in a slight tax increase to residents. This is a 7.22% increase in the debt service levy compared to last year's final extension.

Since the District's 2020 operating levy request is not more than 105% of last year's final extension, it is not required to hold a public hearing on the levy but the Board may still wish to do so, and in the past has still held the hearing. It would be staff's intent to formally approve the amount to be levied and approve the Truth and Taxation Resolution at the October 20 regular meeting, and then approve the Levy Ordinance at the November 17 regular meeting. If held, the public hearing on the levy would be held at the November 17 regular meeting as well. The Levy Ordinance must be filed with the County Clerk's office by the last Tuesday in December (December 29, 2020).



	x Rates 2019 Rate	<u>Fund</u>	Tax Year 2019 <u>Extension</u>	Proposed Tax Year 2020 <u>Extension</u>	% <u>Increase</u>	Relevant Considerations
0.3500	0.2411	Corporate	2,278,968	2,300,000	0.92%	The 2020 tax year levy will be used to cover general operating increases in utilities, contractual services, wages, health insurance, postage, supplies, etc. In addition, an amount of \$500,000 has been used annually to fund the District's capital projects program. Despite COVID, staff expects fund balance to be maintained at or near current levels, due in part to a reduction of expenditures and operating a successful beach season. The undesignated projected fund balance level at the end of the year is 79%. Due to the COVID unknowns, the Board did not "commit" any monies for future Fund 69 capital in FY21/22.
0.3700	0.1163	Recreation	1,099,311	1,230,000	11.89%	The 2020 tax year levy will also be used to cover general operating increases as described above. It is expected that enrollments in District programs will eventually rebound, just no idea at this point as to when. The program net surplus is used to offset the deficit operations of running Takiff Center. Adequate fund balance levels are key to the financial health of this fund. The undesignated projected fund balance at the end of the year is approximately 57%, obviously reduced (by 8%) due to COVID. Due to this reason, the Board did not "commit" for future Fund 69 capital in FY21/22. Staff recommends shifting some Corporate levy dollars this year to Recreation.
0.0400	0.0385	Special Recreation	363,769	350,000	-3.79%	Preliminarily, NSSRA contribution will increase 3-5% from current \$111,300 to around \$115,000 to fund addl maintenance costs on new building. Companion fees will likely be maintained at \$50,000. New building contribution is \$100,063. Projected fund balance at the end of the year is 37%. Staff looks to maintain rate at current maximum level.
None	0.0401	IMRF	379,040	400,000	5.53%	Next fiscal year, employer IMRF contribution rate will decrease from 12.27% to 11.84%. IMRF participation increased significantly due to the day care expansion. Projected fund balance at the end of the year is approximately 40%. Staff recommends a levy amount equal to the anticipated budget amount.
None	0.0322	Social Security	304,366	340,000	11.71%	This employer FICA contribution rate remains at 6.2% and the Medicare contribution rate remains at 1.45%. Projected fund balance at the end of the year is only 17%. To build fund balance reserve, staff recommends a levy amount larger than the anticipated budget amount, which was significantly increased due to the day care expansion.
None	0.0166	Liability Insurance	156,909	160,000	1.97%	PDRMA continues to maintain single-digit increases in general liability, property, and employment practices insurance coverages by utilizing their rate stabilization fund. Unemployment claims have been maintained at same level despite COVID. Projected fund balance at the end of the year will be 89%. Staff recommends that the levy amount in this fund be equal to the anticipated budget for new year.
None	0.0046	Workers Comp	43,480	46,000	5.80%	PDRMA anticipates a similar increase in worker compensation insurance premiums, per the rationale above. Projected fund balance at the end of the year is 58%, and staff recommends a levy amount equal to the anticipated budget for the new year, which has been increasing with the expansion of the day care program.
0.0050	0.0014	Audit	<u>13,233</u>	17,000	28.47%	Levy amount includes no increase in audit fees as they will remain \$12,350 for the fourth year of a 5-year contract extension with Lauderbach & Amen. Projected fund level at the end of the year is 22%.
	0.4908	Subtotal-Operating	4,639,076	4,843,000	4.40%	
None	0.1294	Bond & Interest	1,223,198	1,311,515	7.22%	Levy amount is automatically determined by the County based on all bond ordinances on file. The amount levied includes the new 2020 Series principal (\$170,000) and interest (\$107,065) for a total of \$277,065. The amount levied for the 2015 Refunding Series includes principal (\$875,000) and interest (\$159,450) for a total of \$1,034,450. (Note, the levy amount does not yet reflect the 5% loss factor added by the County.)
	0.6202	Total - All Funds	5,862,274	6,154,515	4.99%	

NOTE: Fund balance percentages are calculated by dividing projected 2/28/21 fund balance by budgeted FY2020/21 annual operating expenditures.

GLENCOE PARK DISTRICT FY2021/22 BUDGET FUND BALANCE SUMMARY

	0/00/0000	0/00/0004	0/00/0004
	2/29/2020	2/28/2021	2/28/2021
	ACTUAL	PROJECTED	Fund Balance %
	FUND BAL	FUND BAL	(of FY20/21expds)
CORPORATE FUND	A- 4 - 000	4004.055	
Undesignated/Transfer to Capital Fund?	\$747,828	\$881,655	
Designated - Medical Insurance Reserve	\$12,000	\$10,000	
Designated-Corporate Operating Fund Balance (50%)	\$1,314,588	\$1,530,539	
Designated-Future Capital	\$650,000	<u>\$0</u>	
CORPORATE - TOTAL FUND BALANCE	\$2,724,416	\$2,422,194	79%
RECREATION FUND			
Undesignated/Transfer to Capital Fund?	\$689,816	\$366,146	
Designated-Recreation Operating Fund Balance (50%)	\$2,469,266	\$2,626,658	
Designated-Future Capital	<u>\$850,000</u>	<u>\$0</u>	
RECREATION - TOTAL FUND BALANCE	\$4,009,082	\$2,992,804	57%
MINOR OPERATING FUNDS			
SPECIAL RECREATION FUND	\$142,256	\$143,133	37%
PENSION/RETIREMENT FUND	\$198,125	\$165,425	40%
SOCIAL SECURITY/MEDICARE FUND	\$49,216	\$52,516	17%
BOND & INTEREST FUND	\$393,147	\$333,197	26%
LIABILITY INSURANCE FUND	\$163,331	\$158,580	89%
WORKERS' COMPENSATION FUND	\$38,792	\$28,892	58%
AUDIT FUND	\$6,480	\$3,880	22%
SUBTOTAL - OPERATING FUNDS	\$7,724,845	\$6,300,621	
OTHER CAPITAL FUNDS:			
CAPITAL PROJECTS FUND	\$224,087	\$685,000	(Carryover plus \$425,000)
MASTER PLAN CAPITAL FUND	\$1,496,547	\$2,095,000	
2020 BOND PROCEEDS	\$0	\$4,412,700	
SPECIAL TRUST FUND	\$1,173	\$0	
IMPACT FEE FUND	\$0	\$0	
SUBTOTAL - CAPITAL FUNDS	\$1,721,807	\$7,192,700	
		*** *** ***	
TOTAL - ALL FUNDS	\$9,446,652	\$13,493,321	

Glencoe Park District History of Final Levy Tax Extensions September 2020

				ı	Limiting		% +/-	% +/-	% +/-	
Tax			EAV	EAV	Tax	Total EAV	Total	NEW	OLD	
Year	CPI	Total EAV	Old Growth	New Growth	Rate	Inc/(Dec)	EAV	Growth	Growth**	
2020	2.3%					== ==.	4 =00/		2 2 2 2 4	
*2019	1.9%	945,237,762	35,815,290	5,658,231	0.462	41,473,521	4.59%	0.63%	3.96%	
2018	2.1%	903,764,241	(44,622,502)	7,186,106	0.462	(37,436,396)	-3.98%	0.76%	-4.74%	
2017	2.1%	941,200,637	10,099,210	10,546,572	0.431	20,645,782	2.24%	1.15%	1.10%	
*2016	0.7%	920,554,855	166,281,244	5,309,461	0.427	171,590,705	22.91%	0.71%	22.20% *	
2015	0.8%	748,964,150	(33,538,383)	8,126,533	0.518	(25,411,850)	-3.28%	1.05%	-4.33%	
2014	1.5%	774,376,000	1,312,512	6,885,500	0.491	8,198,012	1.07%	0.90%	0.17%	
*2013	1.7%	766,177,988	(88,862,471)	4,339,734	0.485	(84,522,737)	-9.94%	0.51%	-10.45% *	
2012	3.0%	850,700,725	(65,096,549)	5,012,190	0.427	(60,084,359)	-6.60%	0.55%	-7.15%	
2011	1.5%	910,785,084	(114,212,290)	7,988,009	0.384	(106,224,281)	-10.44%	0.79%	-11.23%	
*2010	2.7%	1,017,009,365	(196,141,919)	6,993,287	0.334	(189,148,632)	-15.68%	0.58%	-16.26% *	
2009	0.1%	1,206,157,997	57,174,254	24,028,445	0.273	81,202,699	7.22%	2.14%	5.08%	
2008	4.1%	1,124,955,298	39,624,601	18,336,947	0.284	57,961,548	5.43%	1.72%	3.71%	
*2007	2.5%	1,066,993,750	271,610,592	23,166,226	0.284	294,776,818	38.17%	3.00%	35.17% *	
2006	3.4%	772,216,932	(15,805,477)	17,426,571	0.374	1,621,094	0.21%	2.26%	-2.05%	
2005	3.3%	770,595,838	35,760,402	20,140,599	0.354	55,901,001	7.82%	2.82%	5.00%	
*2004	1.9%	714,694,837	163,446,630	12,357,248	0.357	175,803,878	32.62%	2.29%	30.33% *	
2003	2.4%	538,890,959	(9,698,462)	10,969,839	0.442	1,271,377	0.24%	2.04%	-1.80%	
2002	1.6%	537,619,582	30,706,852	9,847,825	0.452	40,554,677	8.16%	1.98%	6.18%	
*2001	3.4%	497,064,905	89,548,869	13,932,060	0.473	103,480,929	26.29%	3.54%	22.75% *	
2000	2.7%	393,583,976	(10,549,605)	5,708,214	0.526	(4,841,391)	-1.22%	1.43%	-2.65%	
1999	1.6%	398,425,367	9,377,933	5,158,838	0.498	14,536,771	3.79%	1.34%	2.44%	
		, ,								
	2., ,0	, ,	30,001,071	3, 130,001	0.510	50,120,550	11.50 /0	1.01 /0	10.13 /0	
*1998 1997 1996 *1995 1994	1.5% 3.6% 2.5% 2.7%	383,888,596 343,980,123 342,757,009 338,182,183 302,061,625	35,078,769 (1,831,113) 1,384,535 30,661,674	4,829,704 3,054,227 3,190,291 5,458,884	0.502 0.543 0.522 0.518	39,908,473 1,223,114 4,574,826 36,120,558	11.60% 0.36% 1.35% 11.96%	1.40% 0.89% 0.94% 1.81%	10.20% * -0.53% 0.41% 10.15% *	

^{*} Denotes a tri-annual re-assessment year ** Note: Old Growth is capped at CPI.

GLENCOE PARK DISTRICT RESOLUTION No. 917

TRUTH IN TAXATION LAW RESOLUTION

RESOLVED, by the Board of Park Commissioners of the Glencoe Park District, Cook County, Illinois that based upon the most recently ascertainable information, the following estimate of taxes to be levied is hereby made in accordance with Section 60 of the "Truth in Taxation Law":

- 1. The corporate and special purpose property taxes extended or abated for 2019 were \$4,639,076. The proposed corporate and special purpose property taxes to be levied for 2020 are \$4,843,000. This represents a 4.40% increase over the previous year.
- 2. The property taxes extended for debt service and public building commission leases for 2019 were \$1,223,198. The estimated property taxes to be levied for debt service and public building commission leases for 2020 are \$1,311,515. This represents a 7.22% increase over the previous year.
- 3. The total property taxes extended or abated for 2019 were \$5,862,274. The estimated total property taxes to be levied for 2020 are \$6,154,515. This represents a 4.99% increase over the previous year.
- 4. Based on the foregoing, no public hearing or publication is required under the Truth in Taxation Law. However, the Board will still hold a public hearing on the proposed levy on November 17, 2020.

Passed this 20th day of October 2020.

AYES: NAYS: ABSENT:	
	Lisa M. Brooks, President Board of Park Commissioners
	Attested and filed this 20th day of October 2020.
	Lisa M. Sheppard, Secretary Board of Park Commissioners

STATE OF ILLINOIS)
) SS
COUNTY OF COOK)

SECRETARY'S CERTIFICATE

I, Lisa M. Sheppard, do hereby certify that I am Secretary of the Board of Park Commissioners of the Glencoe Park District, Cook County, Illinois, and as such official, I am keeper of the records, ordinances, files and seal of said Park District; and,

I HEREBY CERTIFY that the foregoing instrument is a true and correct copy of Resolution No. 917:

TRUTH IN TAXATION LAW RESOLUTION

adopted at a duly called Regular Meeting of the Board of Park Commissioners of the Glencoe Park District, held at Glencoe, Illinois, in said District held immediately following a 7:00pm Finance Committee of the Whole meeting on the 20th day of October 2020.

I DO FURTHER CERTIFY that the deliberations of the Board on the adoption of said resolution were conducted openly, that the vote on the adoption of said resolution was taken openly, that said meeting was called and held at a specified time and place convenient to the public, that notice of said meeting was duly given to all of the news media requesting such notice, that said meeting was called and held in strict compliance with the provisions of the Open Meetings Act of the State of Illinois, as amended, and with the provisions of the Park District Code of the State of Illinois, as amended, and that the Board has complied with all of the provisions of said Act and said Code and with all of the procedural rules of the Board.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I hereunto affix my official signature and the seal of the Glencoe Park District at Glencoe, Illinois this 20th day of October 2020.

Lisa M. Sheppard, Secretary Board of Park Commissioners Glencoe Park District

[SEAL]

Notice of Proposed Property Tax Levy Increase For Glencoe Park District

I. A public hearing to approve a proposed property tax levy increase for the Glencoe Park District for 2020 will be held on November 17, 2020, at 7:00pm, at the Glencoe Park District, 999 Green Bay Road, Glencoe, Illinois.

Any person desiring to appear at the public hearing and present testimony to the taxing District may contact Lisa Sheppard, Secretary of the Board of Park Commissioners, 999 Green Bay Road, Glencoe, Illinois, telephone number (847) 835-3030.

II. The corporate and special purpose property taxes extended or abated for 2019 were \$4,639,076.

The proposed corporate and special purpose property taxes to be levied for 2020 are \$4,843,000. This represents a 4.40% increase over the previous year.

III. The property taxes extended for debt service and public building commission leases for 2019 were \$1,223,198.

The estimated property taxes to be levied for debt service and public building commission leases for 2020 are \$1,311,515. This represents a 7.22% increase over the previous year.

IV. The total property taxes extended or abated for 2019 were \$5,862,274.

The estimated total property taxes to be levied for 2020 are \$6,154,515. This represents a 4.99% increase over the previous year.

V. Discussion on Recommendation for Health Insurance Renewal

TO: Board of Park Commissioners

FROM: Carol Mensinger and Lisa Sheppard SUBJECT: 2021 Health Insurance Renewal

DATE: October 2, 2020

The District's total health insurance program consists of the following coverages: medical, dental, EAP, and life. Per the Board's decision in July 2020 to remain in the PDRMA Health Program for a three-year commitment, the decisions relating to the 2021 insurance renewal for the District are limited. The renewal for our current PDRMA Health Program medical, dental, EAP and life insurance coverage is effective January 1, 2021. (Specific instructions on our plan, however, must be submitted to PDRMA by October 23 for the open enrollment period which runs from October 26 through November 20).

Currently, the PDRMA Health Program includes 82 member agencies covering over 2,200 employees, and nearly 4,000 covered lives. In 2021, PDRMA is making a change to its coverage structure again, both in how administrative fees are allocated to the coverage types, and to the number of plan options available. The intent in offering these plan options is to allow more flexibility to member agencies in offering coverage to their employees. The majority of PDRMA Health agencies utilize the \$500 PPO deductible plan option, as well as a \$1,500 high deductible plan with the HRA option. All agencies offer the HMO option as an alternative as well.

The premium increase for the PDRMA Health Program for 2021 for PPO/HMO, prescription, dental and EAP coverage for the Glencoe Park District is anticipated at approximately 2.1%. This compares to an increase of 4.0% in 2020, 2.17% in 2019, 4.09% in 2018, and 0% in 2017. In 2021, the increases *by insurance type* are as follows: PPO 2.1%, HMO 3.0%, Dental 3.1% and a 28% decrease for Life, and no increase for EAP coverage. The reason for the higher increase in HMO rates is due to a continuing shift in employees participating in the HMO versus the PPO.

On September 30, the PDRMA Health Program Council (i.e. governing board of directors) approved rates and benefit plan changes to the plan for 2021.

Effective January 1, 2021, the following benefit changes were made by the Health Program Council:

- Changed the PATH wellness vendor to Virgin Pulse. (In June 2020, Interactive Health filed for bankruptcy and immediately closed their doors.)
- Made the following medical plan changes:
 - Decreased OUT-of-network deductibles and Out-of-Pocket maximums with PPO plans with an HRA.
 - o This will act as in additional incentive to get employees to switch to HRA plan.



- o Discontinue \$1250 and \$2500 PPO plans without an HRA.
- o Add \$1500 and \$2000 PPO plans without an HRA.
- Add HRA option to the \$2500 PPO plan.
- o Add \$3500 PPO plan with HRA.
- Will now cover foot orthotics under the PPO Plan when medically necessary and ordered by the physician.
- Will partner with PrudentRx for PPO specialty drugs.
- Will limit PPO Plan specialty medications to a 30-day supply.
- Changed the process by which PDRMA allocates the administrative expense to monthly
 premium rates from a flat fee to one that varies by coverage type, and is more consistent
 with loss funding rates. This change will be transitioned over a 3-year period starting in
 2021.

Applying the new PDRMA 2021 rates to our current \$500 deductible PPO/HMO plans for 34 current eligible full-time enrollees, the total amount of dollars for medical/dental/life/EAP premiums equates to \$596,827. Please see the attached information. This compares to amount for current enrollees with last year's 2020 rates of \$583,488 – resulting in an additional premium cost of \$13,339. This is an increase of approximately 2.29%. It should be noted that unplanned changes during 2021 are possible which may also impact these costs, i.e. employee changes due to resignations, new hires, new babies, and changes in marital status. Further, due to the fact that two employees opted out of coverage for 2020 due to spousal or other family coverage, and three employees opted for dental coverage only, the budgeted cost will include contingency amounts for potential changes in coverage.

Historically, the Board has been willing to absorb premium increases without considerable plan modification. The District's Medical Reserve balance currently stands at \$12,000. (The Medical Reserve was created in 1998 when dependent coverage was waived by several employees when dependent contributions were implemented. Over the years, as fund balance levels in the Corporate Fund have allowed, additional monies have also been set aside in this reserve.)

Two years ago, employees were given an option to move to the higher \$1,250 deductible plan with the added \$1,000 HRA component added...and in exchange, pay a lower monthly contribution. Last year, five employees switched from the traditional PPO plan. If employees utilize all IN-network providers, savings can be considerable. The potential downside is that OUT-Network deductibles/maximum out-of-pockets are higher, however this year, PDRMA has further decreased those OUT of network deductibles and OOP maximums.

In effort to persuade current PPO employees to consider the higher deductible/HRA option if they tend to stay in network, staff will again highlight this \$1250/\$1000 HRA, which would lower the employee's deductible to \$250. As in 2020, the District would recommend to continue to offer the \$500 PPO plan and HMO plan options. The hope is that with a lower monthly employee contribution and lower deductible, many of our employees will choose either the HMO or PPO/HRA options and potentially save the District additional monies. Currently, six employees are enrolled in HMO coverage.



In comparison to other area Park Districts as far as employee contribution amounts, our district typically falls within the median range. Historically, the goal is to bring premium contributions for all coverage types (excluding single) to be 10% of monthly premium (with a slight incentive given to those that choose \$1250 PPO/HRA or HMO option). As such, staff recommends that employee contributions for 2021 be adjusted as follows:

	CURRENT		PROPOSED			
Type of Coverage	PPO	HRA	HMO	PPO	HRA	HMO
Single (13)	\$ 40	\$25	\$20	\$40	\$25	\$20
Employee + Child (1)	\$145	\$130	\$85	\$150	\$135	\$100
Employee + Spouse (4)	\$195	\$160	\$120	\$200	\$170	\$140
Family (8)	\$275	\$220	\$180	\$285	\$240	\$200
Employee + Children	\$190	\$140	\$100	\$200	\$170	\$130

^{*}Two employees with Life/EAP coverage only and three employees with Dental only make no monthly contribution.

For the 2021 renewal, staff recommends to Board of Park Commissioners that the District provide three PDRMA plan options: the \$500 deductible PPO plan, the \$1,250 deductible/\$1,000 HRA option and the HMO Plan. Further, staff also recommends that there be an increase in employee contribution levels as shown above, and that \$2,000 of the Medical Reserve be utilized. (These changes will result in an estimated increase to the District of approximately 1.48%, with a potential for further savings if employees sign up for the \$1,250 deductible/HRA or HMO options.)

In addition, PDRMA approved the return of \$1 million of net position to be returned to member agencies in March 2021. The exact amount to be returned to our District is not yet known, but our plan is to put this money into the Medical Reserve for future use.



PDRMA HEALTH PROGRAM 2020 vs. 2021 RATE COMPARISON

Plan - \$500 Deductible PPO/HMO with Dental, EAP, and Life Insurance

		# of	2020 Rate/	2020 Rate/	2021 Rate/	2021 Rate/
Coverage	Employee's Name	EE's	Month	Year	Month	Year
SINGLE PPO		7	1,076.56	90,431.04	1,059.76	89,019.84
SINGLE DENTAL only		0	53.37	0.00	51.81	0.00
SINGLE HRA		2	1,009.50	24,228.00	990.60	23,774.40
SINGLE HMO		4	746.76	35,844.48	746.08	35,811.84
TOTAL		13		150,503.52		148,606.08
FAMILY PPO (more than one dep)		6	2,744.25	197,586.00	2.856.49	205,667.28
FAMILY HMO		2	1,982.17	47,572.08	2.076.64	49,839.36
FAMILY DENTAL only		1	120.38	1,444.56	123.03	1,476.36
FAMILY HRA		1	2,543.09	30,517.08	2,649.02	31,788.24
TOTAL		10		277,119.72		288,771.24
EMP + SPOUSE HRA		2	1,816.82	43,603.68	1,863.60	44,726.40
EMP + SPOUSE PPO		3	1,954.28	70,354.08	2,005.38	72,193.68
EMP + SPOUSE HMO		0	1,397.55	0.00	1,446.95	0.00
EMP + SPOUSE DENTAL		2	90.74	2,177.76	91.53	2,196.72
TOTAL		7		116,135.52		119,116.80
EMP + CHILDREN PPO		1	1,877.39	22,528.68	1,922.56	23,070.72
EMP + CHILD PPO		1	1,412.76	16,953.12	1,421.94	17,063.28
TOTAL		2	.,	39,481.80	1,1-11-1	40,134.00
Life/EAP only		2	10.30	247.20	8.30	199.20
Total Madical Communication Communication	- FAR	24		4-00 400		4.00.00
Total Medical Coverage (Medical, Dental,Lif	e, EAP)	34		\$583,488		\$596,827

2.29%

Less: Additional Employee Contributions (\$2,220)
Less: Portion of Medical Insurance Reserve (\$2,500)

VI. Discussion on Watts Ice Rink Operations amidst COVID-19 No Documents

VII. Discussion on Youth Basketball Operations amidst COVID-19 No Documents

VIII. Discussion on Kalk Park Project Phase 2

TO: Board of Park Commissioners

FROM: Lisa Sheppard, Executive Director and Chris Leiner, Director of Parks &

Maintenance

SUBJECT: Kalk Park Renovation Components for Board Discussion

DATE: September 29, 2020

Based upon the Board of Park Commissioner's feedback in the August Board meeting, staff will further outline the proposed concepts of the Kalk Park Project Phase II for further Board discussion.

KALK PARK QUICK FACTS:

• A Phase I projected was completed in 2016 (\$375,000)

- Drainage was not advanced past the planning phase due to cost.
- The existing park lights were removed during the project due to hazardous conditions. Replacement of the park light was not part of the Phase I project. However, the replacement of the electric service was included. The park is construction-ready if the Board chooses to include lights in the scope.
- The project was planned and executed with the thought that future renovation would be necessary.

Staff is proposing including the following project components in the Phase II project.

- Improved drainage: As discussed, the Park District cannot use the park as intended due to site conditions. To develop effective drainage, the site will require significant grading with a drainage system installed. This involves coordination with MWRD and a tie into the Village of Glencoe storm sewer system. This process requires substantial engineering to develop an appropriate specification. For reference, to install drainage pipe costs approximately \$65 a linear foot with each structuring (drain) costing \$1500. The expense of grading is where the majority of costs are. For example, drainage piping at Berlin was approximately \$40,000, while grading was over \$150,000. For comparison, the area in front of Liza's gazebo is approximately the same size as the developed area at Berlin Field.
- Ambient Lighting: Staff has received significant community feedback about the loss of the light and how dark the park is for pedestrian commuters. Staff would propose 1-2 poles for the park site, depending on the desired photo-metrics.
- Planting Bed Irrigation: The Park District uses approximately 8-10 labor hours per week, watering the flowers around the gazebo and in the Park Avenue planting bed. Watering has an approximate cost of \$7,200 per season. Over the expected 18-year lifespan of a commercial irrigation system, staff expects the labor costs to be \$129,000 without adjusting for inflation or factoring in equipment replacement costs.

During the Phase I project, upgrades were made to the water service/supply. The



installation of irrigation in high-profile planting beds is an industry-standard. For the above scope, we project a cost of \$15,000-\$20,000 for the irrigation system as we have the existing water supply. This would have a payback in labor savings in 3 years. For reference, the installation of the water main costs approximately \$12,000.

- Park Entry Masonry Repairs: The existing stone seat wall and decorative pavers are in poor condition. They require tuck-pointing and the re-attachment of stones throughout. The previous maintenance cycle for this area was in the early 1990s.
- Park Planting/Landscape: The park's current landscaping is a result of a former volunteer
 initiative. The landscaping is not uniform and, in some locations, not appropriate for the
 municipal setting. Staff recommends a targeted redesign of high-profile landscape beds
 with an emphasis on native plants, perennials, and material that does not require heavy
 watering or maintenance.
- Basketball Court Fence: In the previous renovation, the Board and staff considered a
 small fence adjacent to the basketball court to keep balls from bouncing into the parking lot.
 At the time, we attempted to add additional plantings in the brush line to prevent this. After
 the project, the Village of Glencoe removed all the bushes on their property between the
 court and the parking lot. Now the balls regularly bounce out into the parking area. Staff is
 proposing adding a fence, the length of the basketball court on the parking lot side to
 prevent this.
- **Sustainability Concepts:** Board members have expressed a desire to see sustainable initiatives included in the project. An example of ideas for consideration includes native rain gardens, bio-swales, and rainwater harvesting for irrigation. Sustainable options do come with increased implementation and operational maintenance costs.
- Architect and Engineer Qualifications: Attached is the qualification of the project team.

Attached: Landscape Architecture and Civil Engineering Services Proposal



Resumes

Josephine Bellalta, ASLA, PLA

PRINCIPAL AND PRESIDENT

Ms. Bellalta has received local and national awards for her work in Landscape Architecture and Urban Design. Her projects the design of include parks, playgrounds and park systems, natural areas, preserves, campus parks, schools, outdoor classrooms, courtyards, plazas and gardens, streets and roadways. Her projects feature universal access and green initiatives such as green roofs, bio-swales, rain gardens, infiltration planters, native planting and innovative storm water management techniques.

Josephine has been involved in many design/build projects. This experience gives her an understanding of buildability, construction scheduling, and construction costs.



EDUCATION	EXPERIENCE	
Master of Landscape Architecture,	2000 to Present	Principal and President, Altamanu Inc., Chicago, IL
University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, Illinois	1998 - 2000	Director of Planning and Landscape Architecture,
		Teng and Associates, Chicago, IL
Bachelor of Liberal Arts in Environmental Studies	1995 - 1998	Senior Landscape Architect, The Lakota Group,
Lake Forest College, Lake Forest, Illinois		Chicago, IL
ROLE ON THIS PROJECT	1994 - 1995	Landscape Designer, Artemisia Inc., Chicago, IL
Project Director	1993 - 1995	Landscape Designer, Daniel Weinbach and Associates,
LICENSES		Chicago, IL
Illinois Licence # 157000737	1988 - 1992	Landscape Designer, Pressley, Cambridge, MA

EXPERIENCE

Park Master Plans, Playgrounds, Stormwater Wetlands, Entryways and Parking Lots, Glencoe Park District, IL

Lead landscape architect for the Master Plans for the Takiff Center and Lakefront Park, the redesign of six playgrounds, development of storm water solutions including bioswales and wetlands that have transformed the wet areas at Takiff into wetland habitat and an educational facility. Worked with and made presentations to Park District Staff, the Board of Commissioners and the Public.

Ref: Chris Leiner CPRP, CPSI, Director of Parks & Maintenance Glencoe Park District , Glencoe, IL. Tel: 847.835.4648 Email:cleiner@glencoeparkdistrict.com

System Wide Master Plans and Projects, Park District of Oak Park, Oak Park, IL

Master Plans through Construction of the redesign and site improvements for Carroll Pk, Euclid Square Pk, Field Pk, Maple Pk, Mills Pk, Scoville Pk, Stevenson Pk, Taylor Pk, Ridgeland Common, Stevenson. All projects were carried out with extensive public outreach. Work included artificial fields, ball fields, tracks, playgrounds, tennis courts, path systems, plazas, historic landscape interpretation and restoration.

Ref: Jan Arnold, Executive Director, Park District of Oak Park, Oak Park, IL. Tel: 708.725.2050 Email: Jan.Arnold@pdop.org

Chicago Public Schools, Site Design, Fields, Playgrounds etc. Multiple Sites in Chicago, IL

Lead landscape architect and directed the Planning, Site Design, Design Development and Construction Observation of over 20 Chicago school renovations and campus parks. Scope items include the design of ball fields, artificial turf fields, playgrounds, outdoor classrooms, courtyards, healing gardens, bio-swales, rain gardens, educational exhibits as well ADA access and streetscape improvements.

Ref: Charles A. Bassett AIA LEED AP, Sr Manager for Planning and Design, Chicago Public Schools, Chicago IL Email: Cbeea@ameritech.net

Oak Park District 97 School Renovations, Oak Park, IL

Project Director for the fast tracked renovations of three (3) elementary schools and four (4) additional school sites. The projects were carried out with an intensive public participation process. The projects were from planning through construction. Included the design of playgrounds, artificial turf fields, and tracks, outdoor classrooms, fencing, seating, site furnishings, and planting design.

Ref: Therese M. O'Neill, Assistant Superintendent Finance & Operations. Email: toneill@op97.org

John Mac Manus, B. Arch., ASLA

ALTAMANU INC., PRINCIPAL PRINCIPAL-IN-CHARGE/OVERALL PROJECT DESIGN

John has worked on the planning and design of parks and the associated projects for the past 30 years. John led the physical design teams for the master planning process for large regional parks in Chicago such as the Lincoln Park Framework plan (1,112 acres) and many local parks in the Chicago system.

He also led the planning and urban design teams for the relocation of Lake Shore Drive, the Museum Forecourt; the Plan for Northerly Island, the Burnham Park Master Plan, and the reconstruction of Lake Shore Drive in Jackson Park. John has been involved in a wide range of projects that have a major environmental component such as planning large scale treatment wetlands and large scale habitat development.



EDUCATION

B. Arch., 1978

D.I.T. Dublin, Ireland

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

Greenwald Chair for Urban Design Studies, University of Illinois at Chicago

EXPERIENCE IN PRACTICE

2005 to Present: Principal, Altamanu Inc., Chicago, IL

Years with in the Industry: 39 years

RELEVANT PROJECTS

Lincoln Park Framework Plan, Chicago IL, Chicago Park District Led the physical design team for the plan that included the analysis of existing facilities and the development of policies and physical plans for 1,112 acres of parkland and facilities. The Plan was developed with an intensive public participation process. Over 90 different agencies, civic groups and community organizations took part.

Millennium Park, Chicago, IL, CDOT/Chicago Park District John worked directly with the Director of the project on the design and coordinated the work of various engineering, architectural and landscape design firms.

North Lake Shore Drive Phase 1, CDOT/IDOT, Chicago, IL

Currently working on the urban design and landscape design components of this 7.5 mile-long project on the northern lakefront of Chicago. Project scope for urban and landscape design includes historic research, existing and historic spatial analysis, tree and vegetative analysis, lakeshore protection, intersection alternate studies, and evaluation of design alternates to determine potential impacts on the neighborhoods and on the lakefront parks. The work includes developing proposals for bike and pedestrian access, the lakefront multi-use trail, and park design.

Multiple Park Master Plans, Park Designs, Park District of Oak Park IL and Village of Oak Park, IL

Oak Park is known for its active and vocal community. John has been engaged by the Village and the Park District of Oak Park for over 12 years to lead the publicly driven design processes for 14 park master plans, the subsequent park designs, and the redesign of streets and entryways to major public spaces. This work was carried out with a series of workshops and meetings with staff, the Boards of both Village and Park District, steering committees, stakeholders, and the community. The projects also included multiple means of community participation including questionnaires, interactive web sites, and design charrettes.

Van Vlissingen Prairie, Chicago Park District, Chicago, IL

Lead Urban Designer for the Master Plan for this 135-acre postindustrial environmental park. The master plan was carried out with community and multiple agency participation. John went on to lead the development of detailed design and construction documents for the first phase. The goals of the project are to restore habitat and provide active and passive nature-based recreation. Trails, boardwalks and a "Woodland Allée" that runs almost the entire length of the site lead visitors through or along the full range of eco-types the site offers, including meadow, savannah, woodland, vernal ponds, wetlands, and prairie.



FIRM OVERVIEW

EVA DESIGN AND ENGINEERING LLC is a consulting engineering firm that provides professional site design and engineering services. EVA is an organization that is built on reputable service, innovative design, and technical expertise. The Founder has over 18 years of design and construction experience and possesses a diverse knowledge in many facets of site development from the initial planning phase to construction completion.

EVA carries a holistic approach in land development design and civil engineering. Our approach includes exercising diligence in our work to meet the present-day objectives and being cognizant for future end-users. We are firm believers that the diligence exercised today will progress and benefit the future, tomorrow.

WHAT WE DO

EVA specializes in land development design and offers various services for Phase 1-conceptual planning/assessment, for Phase 2-design/engineering documents, and for Phase 3-construction documentation. Regardless of what the project entails, EVA can provide segmented consultation services or fulfill the role as the Engineer of Record. Our professional staff is licensed to practice engineering in Illinois and New Jersey.

Services Include:

- Site Assessments
- Feasibility Studies
- Masterplanning / Forecasting
- Streetscape Design
- Linear Developments
- Construction Administration
- Geotechnical Engineering Consultation

- Site Plan Design
- Pavement Evaluations
- Low Impact Development Design
- Stormwater Management
- Drainage Evaluations
- Floodplain Evaluations
- Earth Retention Systems





EDUCATION

BACHELOR OF SCIENCE IN
CIVIL ENGINEERING,
NEW JERSEY INSTITUTE OF
TECHNOLOGY, NEWARK, NJ, 2003

LICENSES / CERTIFICATES

PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, IL
PROFESSIONAL ENGINEER, NJ
IL CDB PROJECT MANAGER CERTIFIED
IDOT DOQ CERTIFICATION

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF
CIVIL ENGINEERING
NATIONAL SOCIETY OF PROFESSIONAL
ENGINEERS
PHILIPPINE ENGINEERS & SCIENTISTS
ORGANIZATION, (PAST VICE PRESIDENT)
HISPANIC AMERICAN CONSTRUCTION
INDUSTRY ASSOCIATION.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

EVA DESIGN & ENGINEERING,
PRINCIPAL 2016-CURRENT
TERRA ENGINEERING,
PROJECT MANAGER 2007-2016
FRANK H. LEHR ASSOCIATES,
STAFF CIVIL ENGINEER 2003-2007
KOCH SKANSKA CONSTRUCTION,
CONSTRUCTION FIELD INTERN 2002
RATIA CONCRETE
STAFF PERSONNEL 2000

ARVIN VILLANUEVA, PE M.ASCE PRINCIPAL OWNER

Mr. Villanueva is the Founder of **EVA DES**IGN & **ENG**INEERING, LLC. Mr. Villanueva has been involved in the Construction and Engineering industry for over 20 years. His diverse experience in the Civil Engineering and construction industry encompasses commercial, industrial, waste-water, non-for-profit, residential, transportation, office, clinical, educational, and public developments. Mr. Villanueva has contributed his knowledge and engineering services to over 300 projects within Chicago and the neighboring Chicagoland area.

His work experience in the Civil Engineering industry includes:

- Civil/Site engineering design & evaluations
- ADAAG evaluations & design compliance
- Transportation and Roadway assessments
- Streetscape Designs
- Geotechnical Engineering Consultation
- Construction Oversight/Administration
- Subdivision planning/layout/design
- Floodplain Evaluation and Mitigation Reports
- Stormwater Evaluation and Facility Design
- Sustainability & Low Impact Development Designs

His work experience includes the knowledge of standards and regulations of authorities, agencies, and institutions. These include:

- City of Chicago
- CDOT
- MWRDGC
- USPS

- Lake County SMC
- IEPA
- ADAAG
- NJRSIS

- Army Corps
- IDPH
- CPS
- PBCC

- DuPage County SFPO
- IDOT



September 10, 2020

Mr. Chris Leiner
Director of Parks and Maintenance
Glencoe Park District
999 Green Bay Road
Glencoe, Illinois 60022

<u>cleaner@glencoeparkdistrict.com</u>

RE: Landscape Architecture and Civil Engineering Services Kalk Park in Glencoe, Illinois

Dear Chris,

The Glencoe Park District (GPD/Client) has requested a proposal from the Altamanu to prepare Schematic Design, Prepare Design Development and Construction Documents, provide Bidding and Permit assistance and Construction Administration Services for Improvements to the Kalk Park located at the southeast corner of Park Avenue & Green Bay Road. We understand that this improvement project will go out to bid in the spring of 2021. We have teamed with EVA Engineering for civil and electrical portions of the project. We have worked successfully many times with the Arvin Villanueva of EVA on similar projects.

The overall scope includes the following:

- Provide a solution to the seasonal flooding of the main open area of the park
- Coordinate solutions with MWRD if appropriate
- Add approximately three lights on 14-foot-high poles along the diagonal path through the park
- Prepare a design for the North West corner of the Park that will complement the new plaza and entry to the trail directly to the North.
- Add irrigation to the proposed planting bed on the corner of Park Avenue and the North West corner of the park and at the existing Gazebo.
- Prepare a new planting plan for the same corner
- Add a fence and planting to the edge of the basketball court

SCOPE OF WORK/PROJECT PLAN

The following is an outline of the "Scope of Work" to be carried out by the Altamanu, Inc./EVA team.

TASK 1: SCHEMATIC DESIGN AND PUBLIC INPUT

Goals: Review existing conditions, project scope, budget, schedule and set a direction for Client expectations and public process.

1. Verify existing conditions using available site data such as surveys, aerial photos, and topographic maps. The Client will furnish Altamanu with an accurate base map, site survey and topographic map for the site. The information to be provided will be at a scale appropriate for the preparation of



construction documentation. The survey will show existing contours, detailed site features, and existing utilities to the center line of adjacent streets. The team will verify if the extents of the survey are sufficient for the intended scope of improvements and will advise the Client if any further topographic information is required.

- 2. Review available zoning and landscape codes and advise Client of any requirements. Incorporate requirements into improvements.
- 3. Review potential MWRD permit requirements for the site improvements.
- 4. Meet with Client to review the project scope, budget, and schedule. (Meeting #1)
- 5. Tour the site with Client to refine scope/goals and to field review existing conditions. (Site meeting at same time as project Kick-Off meeting. Altamanu has already toured the site with the Client. Therefore, this is mainly for EVA Engineering to discuss the project with the Client.
- 6. Prepare up to two (2) concepts for the site improvements. Conceptual designs may include plans, reference images, elevations, and or perspective renderings.
- 7. Present concepts to Client. Client to select a preferred concept. (Meeting #2)
- 8. Make revisions as per Client input of preferred concept.
- 9. Prepare Rough Opinion of Probable Cost for the preferred concept.
- 10. Present concept to GPD Board for input. (Board Presentation #1. Potentially on-line)
- 11. Make minor revisions as requested by Board prior to commencing the Design Development Phase.

TASK 2: DETAILED DESIGN DEVELOPMENT & CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENTS

Goals: Finalize relevant design elements and incorporate Client's comments and produce the final Construction Documents.

- 1. Prepare Design Development/Construction Documents for a 60%, 90% and 100% review with the Client. The Construction Documents will include the following (it is possible that some of these items will be shown on the same plans):
 - Detailed Final Landscape Plan (1"=20')
 - Layout and Dimension Plan (1"=20')
 - Enlarged Site/Landscape Plans as needed for clarity.
 - Site Detail Sheets Layout/Dimensioned of Related Special Site Elements. Selection of Pedestrian Light fixture and pole
 - Grading and Drainage Plan and Details (EVA)
 - Drainage/Utility Details, utility connections, (EVA)
 - Electrical Plan
 - Planting Details, Plant Schedules and General Notes
 - Related Technical Specifications (Altamanu and EVA)



- 2. Continue to field verify existing conditions as necessary to prepare the CD set.
- 3. Coordinate design decisions with Client throughout the DD and CD process.
- 4. Coordinate Landscape Plan with Civil Engineer's Grading/Drainage and Utility Plans.
- 5. Revise Opinion of Probable Cost to reflect adjustments to Landscape/Engineering Plans.
- 6. Submit 60% Construction Set and Outline Specifications to Client for review.
- 7. Meet with Client to review 60% Construction Set. (Meeting #3)
- 8. Coordinate with Village of Glencoe and MWRD (if necessary) and verify permit submission requirements. (Meeting #4)
- 9. Submit 90% Construction Set and Outline Specifications to Client for review.
- 10. Meet with Client to review 90% Construction Set. (Meeting #5)
- 11. Make revisions and submit 100% Construction Set and Specifications to Client for final review.
- 12. Submit Final 100% Construction Documents Package and related Technical Specifications, including EVA plan for permit, to Client for review and subsequently for bidding.

TASK 3: PERMITTING, BIDDING & BID ASSISTANCE

Goal: Assist in obtaining appropriate approvals as required for construction. Assist in the packaging and distribution of construction drawing sets and specifications to potential contractors. Altamanu will review and assess bids with Client and assist in the selection of a contractor(s). Timetables and schedules for construction will be established with selected contractors.

- 1. Assist Client in submitting Permit Set for appropriate approvals and coordinate with Village of Glencoe on any permit approvals from MWRD. (EVA will manage permit approvals)
- 2. Provide Client Construction Set prior to bidding for review.
- 3. Issue addenda as appropriate to interpret, clarify or expand the Construction Documents.
- 4. Meet with Client to assist in preparation of Bid Packages. Use Site Landscape Construction Bid Form, cover letter and related addenda to include with Bid/Drawing Package. Distribute Bid/Drawing Package to contractors on selected list as vetted by team.



- 5. Assist the Client in conducting a Pre-Bid Review Meeting with selected Contractors. (Meeting #6)
- 6. Assist Client in preparing Bid Analysis for comparison of proposed bids.
- 7. Assist Client with the selection(s) of appropriate contractors.
- 8. Assist in the preparation AIA/GPD Contract between contractors and Glencoe Park District (GPD).
- 9. Develop Landscape Installation Timetable with Client & Contractor.

TASK 4: CONSTRUCTION ADMINISTRATION & PROJECT CLOSEOUT

Goal: Provide on-site review and observation of landscape construction related to the Site Landscape Construction Package and its Related Specifications.

- 1. Provide on-site observation of site and landscape construction related to the Altamanu-EVA Landscape and Engineering Plans and their related elements. Visit site eight (8) times at intervals appropriate to the stage of landscape construction to review proper construction methods and adherence to the design intent. (Site Meetings #7 through #14). EVA/Civil Engineer will visit the site four times (4) at intervals appropriate to the stage of civil engineering items
- 2. Make written reports regarding site construction progress for landscape improvements.
- 3. Review and respond to contractor's requests for information and provide interpretations and clarifications for the Construction Documents.
- 4. Review and approve samples of materials and shop drawings and assess change order requests.
- 5. Review contractor's request for payments.
- 6. Conduct a final on-site observation/inspection of Landscape Construction with Client and Contractor. (Site Meeting #15)
- 7. Prepare a Final Punch List prior to final acceptance of job.
- 8. Troubleshoot for 1 month until project closeout. (8 hours)



PROFESSIONAL FEES

Fees for the project are broken down by discipline are as follows:

Estimated Landscape Architecture Fees (Altamanu)	
Task 1 Schematic Design & Public Input	\$ 5,100.00
Task 2 Design Development & Construction Documents	\$ 8,425.00
Task 3 Permitting, Bidding and Bid Assistance	\$ 2,065.00
Task 4 Construction Administration & Project Closeout	\$ 4,365.00
Estimated Total Landscape Architecture Fees (Altamanu)	\$19,955.00
Civil Engineering Fees (EVA)	
Task 1 Schematic Design & Public Input	\$ 3,000.00
Task 2 Design Development & Construction Documents	\$ 8,650.00
Task 3 Permitting, Bidding and Bid Assistance	\$ 1,800.00
Task 4 Construction Administration & Project Closeout	\$ 2,550.00
Total Civil Engineering Fees (EVA)	\$16,000.00
Expenses	
Estimated Expenses	\$ 1,000.00
Estimated TOTAL PROFESSIONAL FEES & EXPENSES (Altamanu & EVA)	\$ 36,455.00

Reimbursable expenses which will be billed at direct expense. Reimbursable expenses related to this project shall include, but may not be limited to the following:

- Transportation/Parking
- Reproduction
- Special Supplies
- Photography
- Copies
- Messenger/Delivery
- Large Scale Scans
- Soils Analysis/Consultation

Professional fees and expenses will be billed monthly for work completed and are due within 30 days.

ASSUMPTIONS

- All base information; site survey, site topography and site utility information, will be provided by the Client to Altamanu.
- Site base information will be provided to in a form compatible with AutoCAD 2019 format.
- This agreement does not include soils or environmental studies or property surveys.
- Any services beyond what is outlined above will be considered extra services and will be billed at 5 | P a g e



our standard hourly rates.

Very truly yours,

• This agreement may be terminated by either party 15 days after written notice. Altamanu will be compensated for all services performed up to this date.

If the aforementioned terms are acceptable to you, we would appreciate the execution of this document in the space provided below and the return of a copy for our files.

We at Altamanu Inc. appreciate this opportunity to continue working with the Glencoe Park District.

THE METERIAL	
Josephine Bellalta, PLA, ASLA, President	Altamanu Inc.
ACCEPTED BY:	
Signature	
Printed Name	
Title	
Date	



EXHIBIT A

EVA ENGINEERING PROPOSAL

DATED: